

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

A proposed drawing change is submitted herewith. Proposed changes are shown in red. The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. This sheet, which includes Fig. 2, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 2. In Fig. 2, previously omitted reference character -- 26' -- has been added.

Attachment:	Replacement Sheet
	Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

## **REMARKS**

By the present amendment, Applicant has canceled Claims 1-8 , and added Claims 9-14. Claims 9-14 remain pending in the present application. Claims 9 and 12 are independent claims.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview held June 30, 2005. The present response summarizes the substance of the interview. At the interview a proposed amendment to the claims was presented for discussion. Proposed new independent Claim 9 set forth a storage tank for providing initially hot water to a faucet of a tub. The storage tank includes a tank having influent and effluent connectors, an insulation layer surrounding the tank. The tank has a substantially serpentine water flow pattern internally of the insulation layer, allowing for the maximum temperature of the water stored therein. In operation, the storage tank provides instantaneous hot water via the opening of a hot water faucet. Arguments were advanced that the prior art of record failed to show the serpentine water flow pattern of the storage tank. The Examiner indicated the particular water flow pattern of the tank must be searched upon the filing of a formal response.

Applicant has amended the specification to further describe the internal serpentine configuration of the storage tank, as shown and described in Fig. 2. Applicant submits that no new matter has been entered.

In the recent Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an enabling description of the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Specifically, Applicant's find no significant

difference between a tub and a sink because they both are basins coupled to at least a water supply and a drainage system, and each define a predetermined volume capacity with which washing is accomplished. The volume capacity is the only significant difference between a tub and sink. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this particular ground of rejection.

Claims 1, 3, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2-296937. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2-296937. Claims 5-6 was were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2-296937 in view of JP 5-125751. The cancellation of Claims 1-8 by the present amendment serves to render these particular grounds of rejection moot.

Applicant will advance arguments hereinbelow to illustrate the manner in which the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited and applied prior art. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The applied prior art references to the JP '937, and JP '751 fail to show a serpentine internal configuration within which the water flows from the influent connector to the effluent connector, for providing the initially hot water upon opening of the hot water faucet. Applicant respectfully submits that these applied references, alone or in combination, neither anticipates nor renders obvious the instant claims.

Applicant has rewritten the claims as newly presented Claims 9-14. Newly presented independent Claims 9 and 12, each recite that the storage tank includes a serpentine water flow pattern internally of insulation layer. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least this reason, newly presented Claims 9-14 are allowable over the prior art applied of record.


*Application Serial No.: 10/768,150*  
*Art Unit: 3751*

*Attorney Docket No. 24024.00*  
*Confirmation No. 6427*

The claims in this application have been revised to more particularly define Applicant's unique construction in view of the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendments is respectfully requested.


For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard C. Litman", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Richard C. Litman  
Registration No. 30,868  
(703) 486-1000

RCL:DHT:wse



*Fig. 2*